REMARKS

Claims 1-66 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 67 and 72 are amended. Claims 67-72 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant traverses the Office's rejections and respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the time that the Examiner spent on the telephone discussing this application and the outstanding rejections on August 4, 2005. In view of that discussion, Applicant has made some clarifying amendments discussed below.

Restriction Requirement

Applicant affirms its election of claims 67-72 for prosecution in the current application. Accordingly, claims 1-66 have been canceled without prejudice.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 67-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,778,992 to Searle et al. (hereinafter "Searle").

The Claim Rejections

Claim 67 has been amended and, as amended, recites a method of rendering a skin comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- defining one or more subviews, each subview corresponding to a subsection within a skin that can be moved or hidden;
- defining multiple visible regions, individual visible regions being associated with the one or more subviews, the visible regions representing individual areas to which their associated one or more subviews are drawn;
- defining a tree structure having multiple nodes, each node being associated with a visible region and having one or more attributes, ***at least some of the attributes being changeable by a user interaction with a visible region***;
- recalculating a visible region for a node responsive to ***a user-induced*** attribute change for the visible region;
- recalculating a visible region associated with a parent node of said node; and
- after said acts of recalculating, re-rendering a skin associated with the tree structure.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Searle defines a tree structure with multiple nodes, each node associated with a visible region having an attribute, recalculating a visible region for a node responsive to an attribute change for a visible region, recalculating a visible region associated with a parent node of the node (citing to Figure 4 and the corresponding text). Applicant respectfully submits that this is simply not the case. As such, Searle does not anticipate this claim. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended its claim above to clarify the subject matter.

The only similarities between of Searle's Fig. 4 and Applicant's recited subject matter is that each is associated in some way with a tree—that's where the similarity ends. Specifically, Searle discloses a ***representative hierarchy*** of user interfaces in Fig. 4 and the related discussion. Searle's Fig. 4 simply illustrates different levels that a user interface can have, e.g. a base first level defined by a first file, a second level defined in other files and the like.

Applicant's amended claim, on the other hand, recites defining one or more subviews, each subview corresponding to a subsection within a skin that can be moved or hidden; defining multiple visible regions, individual visible regions being associated with the one or more subviews, the visible regions representing individual areas to which their associated one or more subviews are drawn; defining a tree structure having multiple nodes, each node being associated with a visible region and having one or more attributes, ***at least some of the attributes being changeable by a user interaction with a visible region***; recalculating a visible region for a node responsive to ***a user-induced*** attribute change for the visible region; recalculating a visible region associated with a parent node of said node; and after said acts of recalculating, re-rendering a skin associated with the tree structure.

Nowhere does Searle disclose or suggest any such subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claims 68-71 depend from claim 67 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 67, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 72 has been amended and, as amended, recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in bold italics]:

- define one or more subviews using an XML data structure, each subview corresponding to a subsection within a skin that can be moved or hidden;
- define multiple visible regions, individual visible regions being associated with the one or more subviews, the visible regions representing individual areas to which their associated one or more subviews are drawn;
- define a tree structure having multiple nodes, each node being associated with a visible region and having one or more attributes, ***at least some attributes being changeable by a user interaction with a visible region;***
- recalculate a visible region for a node responsive to ***a user-induced*** attribute change for the visible region;
- recalculate a visible region associated with a parent node of said node; and
- responsive to said acts of recalculating, re-render a skin associated with the tree structure.

For the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 67, this claim is allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability to be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than an issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 8/4/05

By: _____

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38605
(509) 324-9256